

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Non-Final Office Action mailed October 5, 2004. Claims 1 to 29 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, and 17 are amended by way of this response.

The Office Action objected to Claims 7, 8, 10-26 as being dependant on a rejected base claim, but indicated that Claims 7, 8, 10-26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7, 8, 10, and 17 have been amended to be in such independent form. Claims 11-16 depend from Claim 10, and Claims 18-26 depend from Claim 17. Accordingly, allowance of Claims 7, 8, 10-26 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being unpatentable over Franks Jr. (US 4,780,096). Independent Claim 1 as currently presented overcomes Franks Jr.. Specifically, Claim 1 now recites “wherein the curved surface is fixed relative to the stud.”

Franks Jr. does not teach such a system. Instead, Franks Jr. teaches that “[w]hen the stud 30 is turned, the uppermost curved plate 35a, being positioned upon the unthreaded shank portion 31 of the stud 30, is maintained in a fixed position while the stud 30 rotates relative thereto.” (col. 3, ll. 54-57; emphasis added).

Because Franks Jr. does not teach or suggest each feature of the claims of the present invention, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

James F. Goedken (44,715)

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4250

Dated: January 5, 2005